

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-25 and 27-29 were examined by the Office, and in the final Office Action of January 21, 2010 all claims are rejected. With the previous response to the non-final Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-10, 12, 16, 20, 22-25 and 27-28 were amended. However, in the present Office Action, it appears that only claims previously filed were examined and the amendments were overlooked. With this response, claims 1, 3 and 6-10 are amended. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

This response is submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

Claim Rejections Under § 102

In section 4, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-10, 12-16, 20-25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Setogawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,822,024). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa, because Setogawa fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Setogawa at least fails to disclose or suggest that the distinct video sequence identification associated to each picture is arranged to be used for determining which pictures belong to the same video sequence, as recited in claim 1. This is because there is no element in Setogawa that could be used for such purpose. The GOP Header of Setogawa is associated with the whole GOP, not any individual pictures. Therefore, for at least this reason, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa.

The Examiner refers to the “Closed GOP” flag in the GOP Header of Setogawa to be the same as the video sequence identification of the applicant. As previously argued, the “closed GOP” flag is a one-bit flag for indicating a closed GOP, and cannot perform the function of a video sequence identification, for example because such a one-bit field can have only two possible values (0 or 1).

In order to differentiate from the “GOP Header” and “closed GOP” flag even more clearly, claim 1 recites “each picture of the at least one video sequence has a distinct video sequence identification separate from the picture identification associated to the picture.” In Setogawa, there is no distinct video sequence identifier for each picture of the at least one video sequence. The GOP Header is common for the pictures in the GOP, not distinct.

As previously argued, Setogawa is related to a method and apparatus for coding a picture sequence, whereby the sequence may comprise I-pictures, P-pictures and B-pictures accommodated/as groups of pictures (GOPs), and enabling editing of the same. In order to achieve this, the method disclosed by Setogawa comprises replacing the picture immediately following a cut scene with that of an I-picture. In contrast to Setogawa, claim 1 recites that each picture of at least one video sequence has an associated a distinct video sequence identification separate from the picture identification for the encoded pictures, the video sequence identification has the same value for each picture of the same video sequence, and the video sequence identification is arranged to be used for determining which pictures belong to the same video sequence.

In Setogawa, there is no disclosure how any arranging of data by the rearrangement circuit 42 is carried out. Specifically, there is no disclosure that any video sequence identification would be arranged to be used for determining which pictures belong to the same group of pictures. By using the video sequence identification separate from the picture identification there is no requirement to maintain a check on the picture stream to detect when a specific GOP begins, as the sequence identification is able to identify which picture belongs to the same group of pictures. The disclosure of Setogawa does not provide for this advantage of the present invention.

Independent claims 6 and 8-10 contain limitations similar to claim 1, and therefore for at least for the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, these independent claims are not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa.

The claims depending from the independent claims listed above are also not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa at least in view of their dependencies.

In addition, claim 12 recites that “the first and second transmission units being units adapted for network transmission and being different from video coding units of the first and second encoded picture,” and that “the first and the second identifiers being different from the video coding units of the first and the second encoded picture.” This makes it very clear that Setogawa does not disclose the features of claim 12, since Setogawa only speaks of “GOP Header” and the like elements that are video coding units, not any transmission units adapted for

network transmission. For example, Setogawa states that “The GOP is a unit of image transmission and also a unit of the coding and decoding in the MPEG standard” (see col. 1, lines 43-45). Consequently, Setogawa does not disclose identifiers being different from video coding units that would be indicative of the respective decoding order of information included in the transmission units.

In Setogawa, there is no disclosure how any arranging of data by the rearrangement circuit 42 is carried out. Specifically, there is no disclosure that any identifiers indicative of the respective decoding order of information in transmission units would exist. Consequently, there is no disclosure that any arranging using identifiers would be carried out. In contrast, Setogawa discloses only order of display, that is, an order after decoding (see Fig. 6c, “Order of display” element of Picture Header). Therefore, Setogawa does not disclose transmission units nor identifiers indicative of decoding order, and is different from the present invention as claimed.

Independent claims 16, 20-25 and 27-28 contain limitations similar to claim 12, and therefore for at least for the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 12, these independent claims are not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa.

The claims depending from the independent claims listed above are also not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa at least in view of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 7, on page 7 of the Office Action, claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Setogawa in view of Bigham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,677,905). Claims 17 and 19 ultimately depend from independent claim 16, and Bigham fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Setogawa identified above. Therefore, claims 17 and 19 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 8, on page 8 of the Office Action, claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Setogawa in view of Watkins (U.S. Publ. Appl. No. 2004/0039796). Claim 18 ultimately depends from independent claim 16, and Watkins fails to make up for the

deficiencies in the teachings of Setogawa identified above. Therefore, claim 18 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 13 April 2010



Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955